

---

# **The Status of Federal Block Grants in Illinois, FY 2002**

---

## ***Annual Report to the Illinois General Assembly***

---

**May 2002**

***Research Memorandum No. 115***

*Prepared by the*  
ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION  
707 Stratton Building  
Springfield, Illinois 62706  
(217) 782-6924

---

### **Joint Committee on Legislative Support Services**

James "Pate" Philip  
*Senate President*

Michael J. Madigan  
*Speaker of the House*

Emil Jones, Jr.  
*Senate Minority Leader*

Lee A. Daniels  
*House Minority Leader*

### **Commission Members**

---

#### ***Senate***

Kimberly A. Lightford, *Co-Chair*  
Kirk W. Dillard  
Judith A. Myers  
William E. Peterson  
Margaret Smith  
Larry Woolard

---

#### ***House***

Kathleen L. Wojcik, *Co-Chair*  
William B. Black  
Elizabeth Coulson  
Thomas J. Dart  
Mary E. Flowers

Lisa Groesch, *Executive Director*  
Sandra Roberts, *Associate Director*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Table of Contents .....	iv
Purpose.....	1
Introduction .....	2
(1) Community Mental Health Services Block Grant.....	4
(2) Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse Block Grant .....	6
(3) Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant .....	8
(4) Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant.....	11
(5) Social Services Block Grant .....	12
(6) Low-Income Home Energy Assistance.....	16
(7) Community Services Block Grant .....	17
(8) Community Development Block Grant—State's Program.....	19
(9) Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Block Grant .....	21
(10) Child Care and Development Block Grant .....	23
(11) Local Law Enforcement Block Grant .....	25
(12) Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant .....	27
(13) Emergency Management Performance Block Grant .....	29
Advisory Committee Action .....	31

## **PURPOSE**

---

The Advisory Committee on Block Grants, through the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation, is authorized to review, analyze and make recommendations to the General Assembly and the Governor concerning the use of federal block grant funds by Illinois state agencies. This report provides summary information on each of the block grants that will be operational in state FY 2002, and includes a table that shows the amount of federal block grant funds awarded to Illinois state agencies from FFY 1999 (actual) to FFY 2003 (estimated).

The report is intended to provide information about which state agencies administer the block grants; what the block grants are intended to do; how the federal funds are allocated; how much money is available to Illinois; what state services, programs and policies are supported; and what kind of public input is utilized.

The statutory authority to make recommendations concerning block grants administered by Illinois state agencies is based on an ideal time frame that unfortunately does not exist. The statute assumes that by the March 15 deadline each agency will have completed a cycle of drafting a block grant expenditure plan for the upcoming fiscal year, holding public hearings on the proposal, and submitting a copy of the plan to the Advisory Committee on Block Grants. The Advisory Committee could then review the submitted plans, hold hearings on its own, and issue a report with recommendations by May 1. The General Assembly would then be able to review the recommendations prior to the beginning of the state fiscal year on July 1.

In reality, however, the agencies do not have plans for the upcoming fiscal year available by March. Since the federal fiscal year (FFY) does not start until October 1, the federal agencies do not require states to submit their plans until August or September. In addition, Congress often does not enact the federal budget until September or October. Therefore, although this report reviews block grants that will be in place in state FY 2003, the information and fiscal data reflect FY 2002 dollars.

## INTRODUCTION

---

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (PL 97-35) restructured federal-state fiscal relations by consolidating many existing categorical grant programs into nine newly authorized block grants. This change was an attempt to simplify grant paperwork requirements and to give states more discretion over the spending of federal grant funds. Since 1981, additional block grants have been created, and some have been eliminated. The Job Training Partnership Act, which started in 1982 and was reauthorized in 1993, was replaced by the Workforce Investment Act in 2000. The new grant program will provide money to states for workforce training, but not in the form of a block grant. The Criminal Justice Block Grant, which began in 1985, was terminated in 1988, and the Welfare to Work Block Grant, which was created in 1997, was phased out in 2000. In 1991, the original Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant was split into two grants: a Block Grant for Community Mental Health Services and a Block Grant for the Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse. The Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Act became law in 1995, and then, in an attempt to reform the welfare system, Congress enacted two new block grants in 1996: the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant and the Child Care and Development Block Grant. Interestingly, the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant was initiated by adding substantive language to the FFY 1998 appropriations bill for the U.S. Department of Justice. In 2000, several emergency services grants were combined into the Emergency Management Preparedness Grant Program.

Block grants currently used by Illinois state agencies provided approximately \$1.2 billion in FFY 2002 or about 10.8% of all the federal funds received (see accompanying table). This accounts for only .2% of the state budget of \$55.1 billion.

Older block grants have been characterized by relative stability over the past years. With a few exceptions, funds available from Washington have not changed dramatically, and state agency decision-making appears to reflect incremental budgeting. The mix of programs and services supported by block grant dollars has remained steady, providing continuity to local governments and community-based service providers. According to a survey of relevant state agencies, the existing block grants are operating smoothly and there are no controversial or unsettled issues involving their administration. There is some concern about the reauthorization of TANF. State officials hope that there will be no reduction in funding and that program flexibility will continue. The decline in funding for the Social Services Block Grant is another concern because in Illinois the monies are used to assist those who need help in transitioning from welfare to work.

### Federal Block Grant Awards to Illinois, FFY 1999-2003

(\$ in thousands)

<b>Block Grants</b>	<b>Actual FFY 1999</b>	<b>Actual FFY 2000</b>	<b>Actual FFY 2001</b>	<b>Estimated FFY 2002</b>	<b>Proposed FFY 2003</b>
Mental Health	\$11,635.0	\$11,005.0	\$11,005.0	\$16,747.0	\$16,700.0
Substance Abuse	60,439.0	61,204.0	65,196.0	67,579.7	69,900.0
Maternal & Child Health	23,024.0	23,223.0	23,500.0	24,139.3	23,500.0
Preventive Health	5,390.0	4,960.0	4,749.0	3,178.0	3,200.0
Social Services	86,865.0	100,400.0	75,900.0	75,600.0	74,500.0
Low-income Home Energy Assistance	61,612.0	62,196.0	132,058.0	96,901.0	79,200.0
Community Services	23,420.0	23,475.0	21,800.0	30,561.4	30,500.0
Community Development – Small Cities	38,177.0	37,664.0	37,978.0	39,089.7	39,000.0
Temporary Assistance to Needy Families	585,057.0	606,625.0	585,057.0	585,765.6	585,100.0
Child Care & Development	137,893.0	153,300.0	192,100.0	202,200.0	202,200.0
Job Training and Partnership Act <sup>1</sup>					
• Title IIA – Adult	38,991.0	38,888.0	0.0	0.0	na
• Title IIC – Youth	5,334.0	40,375.0	0.0	0.0	na
• Summer Youth	35,116.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	na
• Dislocated Workers	37,656.0	33,945.0	0.0	0.0	na
Welfare To Work <sup>2</sup>	50,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	na
Local Law Enforcement	31,665.0	1,106.0	1,106.0	0.0	na
Juvenile Accountability Incentive	9,262.0	8,337.0	8,337.0	7,179.0	na
Emergency Management Performance	3,731.0	3,990.1	3,990.1	3,931.5	na
<b>TOTAL Block Grants</b>	<b>\$1,245,267.0</b>	<b>\$1,210,693.1</b>	<b>\$1,162,776.1</b>	<b>\$1,152,872.2</b>	<b>\$1,123,800.0</b>
<i>TOTAL Federal Aid</i>	<i>\$8,444,159.0</i>	<i>\$9,512,892.0</i>	<i>\$10,650,824.0</i>	<i>\$10,717,685.0</i>	<i>na</i>
<i>Block Grants as a % of Federal Aid</i>	<i>14.7%</i>	<i>12.7%</i>	<i>10.9%</i>	<i>10.8%</i>	<i>na</i>

- 1) The Job Training Partnership Act was eliminated at the end of FY 2000. Many of the programmatic functions of the JTPA were incorporated in the Workforce Investment Act, which provides grants to state governments, but it is not considered a block grant.
- 2) This block grant has been eliminated.

SOURCE: Prepared by the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation from figures available from the Federal Funds Information for States (FFIS), the commission's annual federal aid survey and data provided by the Departments of Human Services, Public Aid, Public Health, Commerce and Community Affairs, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and the Illinois Emergency Management Agency.

## **(1) COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT**

---

**Administered by:** Department of Human Services (DHS).

**Established:** This block grant was created in 1991 as one of two new grants split from the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant (ADAMHS). The original ADAMHS Block Grant was created by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, replacing approximately five categorical programs for alcohol and drug abuse control and for mental health services.

**Program Description:** This block grant provides funds to support community mental health centers for the provision of services for chronically mentally ill individuals, severely mentally disturbed children and adolescents, mentally ill elderly individuals, identifiable populations that are currently undeserved, and for coordination of mental health and health care services provided within health care centers. Not less than 10 percent must be used for seriously emotionally disturbed children and adolescents.

**Formula Description:** Allotments to states are based upon certain weighted population factors including persons aged 18 to 24, 25 to 44, 45 to 64, and 65 or older. Total taxable resources of the states, as well as differences in the costs of providing community health services are also factors that are considered.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002 the block grant funds totaled \$16.7 million, which is less than 0.34% of the department's appropriation of \$4.9 billion.

**State Services Provided:** DHS administers the state's mental health services through ten state-operated facilities and over 210 community-based organizations. The community-based organizations are comprised of community mental health centers, public and private nonprofit agencies, hospitals and medical centers, and university centers. The block grant funds are used to provide services to adults with serious mental illness, and children and adolescents with serious emotional disturbances. Local providers provide care such as assessment and treatment planning, 24-hour crisis intervention, outpatient programs including extended day and respite care, case management and family support services, and a community-based array of residential services with flexible access to public and private hospitalization. The creation of Comprehensive Community Service Networks (CCSNs) in FY 1996 helped improve service by replacing a highly centralized state structure with one that is localized.

**Issues:** The Office of Mental Health (OMH) is making a serious attempt to better integrate services for those clients who have other problems and who may be receiving services from other agencies. For example, OMH is working with the juvenile justice system to provide mental health services to young people with serious emotional disturbances, when they leave detention. OMH is also employing recovered consumers to improve outreach in isolated communities.

**State Policy:** State policy, which is based upon the provisions of Public Law 99-660 and a 1992 initiative by Governor Jim Edgar, represents a move away from institutionalized care in favor of a



comprehensive and integrated mental health system that is community-based. Under Connect98, funds will be spent to create new program capacity for persons with serious mental illness in community settings, in addition to upgrading existing day treatment programs.

**Public Participation:** The Joint Mental Health Advisory Council, which meets quarterly, advises DHS in the areas of planning, development and implementation of the mental health service system in Illinois, including the plan for the Community Mental Health Services Block Grant. The Council is made up of service providers; adults with serious mental illness who are receiving service; and family members of those receiving services. Moreover, as part of the on-going effort to ensure consumer participation in decision-making about services, DHS requires community-based grant applicants to include provisions for consumer involvement in their applications. In addition, public hearings are conducted each year in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** Funding decisions are made in accordance with federal rules, state policy, and needs assessments done by the DHS with citizen input. Federal law requires that not less than 10% of the grant be used for services for children with serious emotional disturbances, and not more than 5% of the grant be used for administration. Also, states are prohibited from spending funds for inpatient care; cash payments to recipients; purchasing, constructing or improving buildings or land; matching funds; or providing research/training funds to any entity other than a public or nonprofit agency. States have discretion in providing services, but must ensure that they are comprehensive, and the services may only be provided through appropriate and qualified community programs. Priority is given to adults with serious mental illness and to children with serious emotional disturbances, and since population density is a consideration, funding is concentrated in the Chicago metropolitan area.

**Funding Levels: Community Mental Health Services Block Grant, Projected Expenditures**

*(\$ in thousands)*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>Outpatient Mental Health</b> (assessment, treatment, medication, crisis intervention, social rehabilitation)	\$ 2,042.3	15.9%
<b>Screening, Assessment and Support Services</b> (screening for severe emotional disturbance, intensive home/school- based treatment, 24-hr. crisis intervention and stabilization)	433.5	3.4%
<b>Residential Mental Health</b> (family care residential service, supported/supervised/assisted residential services, therapeutic group home service)	7,480.4	58.3%
<b>Child &amp; Adult Wraparound</b>	116.7	0.9%
<b>Psychiatric Leadership</b>	2,186.8	17.1%
<b>Case Management</b>	562.0	4.4%
<b>Total Allocated</b>	<b>\$ 12,821.6</b>	<b>100%</b>
 <b>Children and Adolescent Subtotal</b>	 3,577.8	 27.9%
<b>Adult Subtotal</b>	9,243.8	72.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 12,821.6</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
 <b>Unallocated Funds</b>	 <b>\$3,925.4</b>	 <b>23.4%</b>
<b>Total Allocated</b>	<b>\$12,821.6</b>	<b>76.6%</b>
<b>Total Grant</b>	<b>\$16,747.0</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is estimated to receive about \$16.7 million from the federal government. However, the state plan/application will not be submitted until the first week of September 2002 in anticipation of the start of the federal fiscal year on October 1, 2002.*

**(2) PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE  
BLOCK GRANT**

**Administered by:** Department of Human Services (DHS).

**Established:** This block grant was created in 1991 as one of two new grants split from the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant (ADAMHS). The original ADAMHS Block Grant was created by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, replacing approximately five categorical programs for alcohol and drug abuse control and for mental health services.

**Program Description:** This program is designed to provide assistance to states and territories to support projects for the development of more effective prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and activities to deal with alcohol and drug abuse. Not less than 35 percent may be for drug abuse, not less than 35 percent may be used for alcohol abuse and not less than 20 percent may be used for prevention and early intervention of substance abuse. Of the amounts reserved for carrying out drug abuse programs and activities, not less than 50 percent must be expended to provide services to intravenous (IV) drug users. Not less than 5 percent of the total allotment must be used for alcohol and drug abuse programs and services for women (especially pregnant women and women with dependent children) and demonstration projects for the provision of residential treatment services to pregnant women. A new requirement of this block grant mandates that recipients enact laws that prevent the sale of tobacco products to minors under the age of 18. There is also a "hold harmless" provision, under which no state can receive less than its FY 1992 block grant allotment for mental health or substance abuse.

**Formula Description:** Allotments to states are based upon certain weighted population factors including persons aged 18 to 24 in urbanized areas and persons aged 25 to 64.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the block grant funds totaled \$67.58 million, which is 1.4% of the department's appropriation of \$4.9 billion.

**State Services Provided:** DHS coordinates activities in three areas: prevention, intervention and treatment. Prevention awards are given to approximately 125 community-based organizations throughout the state, serving over 1.6 million people. Intervention services include cooperation with other agencies in the areas of criminal justice, student assistance, driving under the influence, and outreach and case management. The treatment component provides services such as detoxification, short-term rehabilitation, long-term rehabilitation, residential aftercare, outpatient treatment, outpatient methadone, and intensive outpatient care. Approximately 100,000 clients have been admitted to treatment programs. DHS meets the federal mandate to target women and family issues by assisting 52 treatment centers that treat women only.

**Issues:** DHS estimates that the number of persons needing treatment is ten times greater than the number served in the last year. There is a waiting list for those individuals seeking treatment for essential services. At the community level, some providers are experiencing difficulties in attracting and maintaining qualified staff, and in moving from program-based service delivery to a system of care designed to identify the multi-dimensional needs of individuals.

**State Policy:** Illinois is committed to establishing a comprehensive service system designed to prevent the onset of substance abuse; to provide a network for the early screening, assessment, intervention and referral of individuals with abuse problems; and to provide a broad range of treatment alternatives to individuals and their families.

**Public Participation:** There is no specific block grant advisory group. However, DHS utilizes a legislatively mandated entity, the Illinois Advisory Council on Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependency. The Council, with a membership representing elected officials, professional organizations, law enforcement, citizens, and other state agencies and organizations, meets quarterly, and has a planning committee that reviews and advises DHS concerning the block grant. Two regional meetings were held to

obtain public input. In addition, public hearings are conducted each year in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** Federal law requires that at least 35% of the grant be used for drug abuse prevention and treatment, 35% for alcohol abuse prevention and treatment, 20% for prevention programs aimed at reducing substance abuse among at-risk populations, and at least 5% to increase the availability of services for pregnant women and women with dependent children. States with a high incidence of AIDS must set aside between 2% and 5% of their funds to provide early HIV intervention services to persons receiving substance abuse treatment. Administrative costs are limited to 5%.

**Funding Levels: Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant, Projected Expenditures**

*(\$ in thousands)*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>Substance Abuse Treatment and Rehabilitation</b>	\$ 47,305.8	70.0%
• Detoxification (24-hr.)		
• Residential Rehabilitation		
• Ambulatory Rehabilitation		
<b>Primary Prevention</b>	13,515.9	20.0%
• Information Dissemination		
• Education		
• Alternatives		
• Community-Based Process		
• Environmental		
<b>HIV Early Intervention</b>	3,379.0	5.0%
Administration *	3,379.0	5.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$67,579.7</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Federal law limits administrative costs to 5% of the grant. DHS appears to be meeting that requirement.

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is estimated to receive about \$69.9 million from the federal government. However, the state plan/application will not be submitted until September 1, 2002, in anticipation of the start of the federal fiscal year on October 1, 2002.*

### **(3) MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT**

**Administered by:** Department of Human Services (DHS), although some programs/services supported by the block grant (such as Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention, Vision and Hearing Screening, and Oral Health) remain with the Department of Public Health (DPH).

**Established:** This block grant was originally created by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, replacing about eight categorical programs involving services such as maternal and child health and adolescent health.

**Program Description:** This block grant provides funds for state and local programs previously funded under federal programs for the following: maternal and child health and crippled children; rehabilitation services for the blind and disabled; children under age 16 receiving Supplemental Security Income benefits; lead-based paint poisoning prevention; sudden infant death syndrome; and adolescent pregnancy.

**Formula Description:** The 1983 appropriation was apportioned based on the distribution of funds among prior programs. Amounts in excess of the 1983 appropriation are allocated on the basis of the poverty population under age 18. Not more than 10% of the block grant funds may be used for administration.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the block grant funds totaled \$24.1 million, which is less than .5 percent of the department's appropriation of \$4.9 billion. However, since 32% of the block grant funds are passed through to the Division of Specialized Care for Children at the University of Illinois, only \$16.4 million is available for DHS.

**State Services Provided:** Approximately 32 percent of the block grant funds are provided to the Division of Specialized Care for Children at the University of Illinois for comprehensive services to children with crippling conditions, and a separate "mini block grant" is awarded to the City of Chicago for maternal and child health services. The remaining funds are used by the state for a variety of services including the following: perinatal and prenatal care, vision/hearing screening, immunizations, childhood lead-based paint poisoning prevention, family planning, and adolescent health care. These services are usually provided by local health departments and private nonprofit agencies using grants received from the state. Grants are awarded using population and/or need factors.

**Issues:** Services provided under the programs supported by this block grant tend to be some of the most cost-effective. For example, studies have shown that every dollar spent on prenatal care results in over \$3 in savings on neonatal intensive care. However, many children are not receiving adequate health care.

**State Policy:** The state provides a broad range of health services for pregnant women, non-pregnant women of child bearing age, and young children with a special emphasis on assisting low-income families in areas that are medically underserved or with high infant mortality rates.

**Public Participation:** There is no specific block grant advisory group. The department makes the block grant application available for public review and comment, and publishes legal notices in newspapers inviting public review and comment. The department also invites comments from other public health advisory and advocacy groups and incorporates the comments in their application. In addition, public hearings are conducted each year in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** Federal law requires that at least 30% of the grant be used for children with special health care needs, and 30% for prevention and primary care services. Administrative costs are limited to 10%. Also, states are prohibited from spending funds for inpatient care; cash payments to recipients;

purchasing, constructing or improving buildings or land; matching funds; or providing research/training funds to any entity other than a public or nonprofit agency. States have discretion in selecting the services to support. The department has done needs assessments and targets funds to areas with high poverty rates and a demonstrated need for services. Priority is also given to medically under-served areas, or areas of high infant mortality and teenage pregnancy.

### **Funding Levels: Maternal & Child Health Services Block Grant, Projected Expenditures**

*(\$ in thousands)*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>Preventive and Primary Care Services for Pregnant Women, Mothers and Infants</b>	\$7,948.2	32.9%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family Case Management</li> <li>• Chicago Healthy Start</li> <li>• Family Planning</li> <li>• Prenatal and Pediatric Primary Care</li> <li>• Perinatal Care</li> <li>• Genetic Counseling and Education</li> <li>• Newborn Screening</li> <li>• Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS)</li> <li>• Chicago Mini-Block Grant</li> </ul>		
<b>Preventive and Primary Care Services for Children and Adolescents</b>	7,987.6	33.0%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teen Parent Services (TPS)</li> <li>• Parents Too Soon Abstinence Education Project</li> <li>• Health Works of Illinois</li> <li>• School Based/Linked Health Centers</li> <li>• Vision &amp; Hearing Screening</li> <li>• Oral Health Needs Assessment and Planning</li> <li>• Dental Sealant Grant Program</li> </ul>		
<b>Services for Children with Special Health Care Needs</b>	7,543.7	31.3%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DSCC Grant</li> </ul>		
<b>Administration *</b>	660.0	2.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 24,139.5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Federal law limits administrative costs to 10% of the grant. DHS appears to be meeting that requirement.

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is estimated to receive about \$23.5 million from the federal government. However, the state plan/application will not be submitted until July 2002, in anticipation of the beginning of the federal fiscal year on October 1, 2002.*

#### **(4) PREVENTIVE HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT**

---

**Administered by:** Department of Public Health (DPH).

**Established:** This block grant was originally created by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, replacing eight categorical programs involving a variety of public health services.

**Program Description:** This program was created to support state efforts formerly funded under programs for rodent control, fluoridation, hypertension, preventive health services demonstrations, deterrence of smoking and drinking among children and adolescents, comprehensive public health services, home health service demonstrations, rape prevention, and emergency medical services.

**Formula Description:** Each state's allocation percentage is based on its FFY 1981 grant receipts relative to the total funds provided to all states in FFY 1981. Funds for the rape prevention portion of the block grant are allocated to states based on the percentage of each state's population to the national population. Not more than 10% of the block grant funds may be used for administration.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the block grant funds totaled \$3.2 million, which is 1.2% of the department's appropriation of \$268.5 million.

**State Services Provided:** Block grant funds flow from DPH to 90 local health departments for a variety of public health services. DPH uses block grant funds to support programs and services in a number of areas including rape and sexual assault, violent and abusive behavior, unintentional injuries, and cancer prevention. Two new programs have been added this year, an infant hearing screening program and the Coordinated Approach to Child Health (CATCH) program, which encourages healthful eating and activity choices by students. Guided by the goals of the Healthy People 2000 initiative, DPH uses some of the block grant funds for its own operations, or competitively awards grants to local health departments (county, multicounty, district and municipal) or nonprofit health agencies for planning and service delivery. Grants are awarded on a formula that is based on population. For example, training is provided to local health department staffs on the effects of, and appropriate interventions for, violent behavior. In addition, sexual assault training is provided through the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Abuse, which in turn funds community-based sexual assault centers. The cervical and breast cancer prevention programs provide money for screening, data collection and analysis, and public awareness campaigns. The CATCH program is designed to enhance child health by promoting healthful eating and activity choices.

**Issues:** Since the funding available is not sufficient to provide a complete array of comprehensive public health services, certain priority areas are identified for support. This provides some flexibility since the priorities for funding can be adjusted in future grant cycles. All local health departments conduct needs assessments as part of their certification by the state. DPH was recently awarded funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to develop a strategic plan for improving public health by developing broad-based partnerships to restructure public health agencies, evaluate the use of technology, and implement local plans as determined by local and state priorities.

**State Policy:** DPH promotes good health through prevention activities designed to reduce deaths due to cancer, heart disease, stroke, homicide, and unintentional injuries (e.g., falls, automobile accidents), and to reduce rapes and attempted rapes.

**Public Participation:** DPH is served by the Illinois Preventive Health Advisory Committee, which reviews and approves the annual block grant application. Public notice is published in state newspapers and the plan is also available for review at regional offices. In addition, public hearings are conducted each year in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** States are prohibited from spending funds to operate emergency medical services systems or to purchase more than 50% of the costs of communications equipment for such systems. States have discretion in selecting the services to support. DPH has done statewide needs assessments and requires all local health departments to conduct local needs assessments and determine local priorities. Funds are targeted to high-risk areas. Federal law limits administrative costs to no more than 10% of the grant.

**Funding Levels: Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant, Projected Expenditures**

*(\$ in thousands)*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Cancer Prevention	650.0	20.4%
Unintentional Injury	450.0	14.2%
Rape & Sexual Assault	304.1	9.6%
Child Health	736.9	23.2%
Newborn Hearing	100.0	3.2%
Assessment, Assurance, Policy	937.0	29.5%
Administration *	na	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,178.0</b>	<b>100%</b>

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is estimated to receive about \$3.2 million from the federal government. However, the state plan/application will not be submitted until fall of 2002.*

---

**(5) SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT**

---

**Administered by:** Department of Human Services (DHS).

**Established:** This block grant was originally created by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, replacing three categorical programs for social services, day care and state and local training.



**Program Description:** Funded under Title XX of the Social Security Act, this program distributes funds to the states for a wide variety of social service programs. The permanent authorization and cap for this program was \$2.8 billion, but in fact, allocations have declined steadily over time. There is an effort to restore the funds to the original \$2.8 billion, but an alternative bill would cut funds further. It is not clear at this point what the funding level will be.

**Formula Description:** Funds are allocated on the basis of state population as a proportion of total U.S. population. The state proportion of the total grant does not change from year to year, but the actual amount varies depending upon congressional appropriation. Allocations are published in the fall for the fiscal year beginning the following October. There is no matching requirement.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the block grant funds totaled \$75.6 million, which is 1.54% of the department's appropriation of \$4.9 billion.

**State Services Provided:** This block grant funds 23 separate social services provided by four Illinois state agencies. Services provided include adoption, case coordination, community placement/maintenance, intervention for victims of domestic violence, youth development services, day care for children, employability development services, family planning, family support, foster care for children, health support, homemaker services, outpatient treatment, protective intervention, rehabilitation and training for the handicapped, rehabilitation and treatment for substance abuse, residential child care, social adjustment and rehabilitation, transportation, treatment/habilitation, and unmarried parents services. The Parents Too Soon program is also funded in part with Title XX block grant funds.

Four state agencies are involved in the social services network: the Departments of Human Services, Children and Family Services, Corrections, and the Department on Aging. The Department of Human Services is the lead agency and is responsible for program management, reporting and auditing requirements. The state agencies may provide services directly, or may contract with public and private community-based agencies for the delivery of social services. Approximately 350,000 participants benefit from these services.

**Issues:** One difficulty in analyzing this block grant is the inability to track the expenditure of federal funds because of the co-mingling of federal grant money with state funds and transfers from other federal funds. DHS argues that this is a benefit, however, because it enables them to maximize the federal dollars received.

**State Policy:** The block grant is intended to meet one or more of five national goals: 1) achieving or maintaining economic self-support to prevent, reduce or eliminate dependency; 2) achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency, including reduction or prevention of dependency; 3) preventing or remedying neglect, abuse or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests; 4) preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care by providing for community-based care, home-based care, or other forms of less intensive care; and 5) securing referral or admission for institutional care when other forms of care are not appropriate.

**Public Participation:** There is a 30-member Social Services Advisory Council that meets at least quarterly to advise DHS on all aspects of delivered or contracted assistance provided to clients. This Council reviews and comments on the annual plan. These meetings are held in compliance with Illinois' Open

Meetings Act and the public is welcome to attend. In addition, public hearings are conducted each year in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** States are prohibited from spending funds for a number of purposes including: cash payments to recipients as a service; cash payments for subsistence or room and board; payment of wages as a social service; purchasing, constructing or improving buildings or land; medical care; and educational services which are generally available to residents without cost. Federal law allows states to spend funds to meet the needs of their resident populations. The mix of services provided in Illinois has been relatively stable over the years, a result not only of decisions made when the block grant began and subsequent incremental budgeting, but also of the current needs of each allied agencies' clients and the annual contracts made with local service providers.

## Funding Levels: Social Services Block Grant, Projected Expenditures

*(\$ in thousands)*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Adoption	\$4,047.0	2.6%
Case Coordination	598.0	0.4%
Community Maintenance	285.1	0.2%
Comprehensive Youth Development	3387.8	2.2%
Day Care	23,898.3	15.4%
Domestic Violence	13,808.2	8.9%
Employability Development	3,808.1	2.5%
Family Planning	3,616.7	2.3%
Family Support	324.5	0.2%
Foster Care	36,444.4	23.5%
Health Support	1,880.6	1.2%
Homemaker	2,932.9	1.9%
Multiple Service Contracts	332.7	0.2%
Outpatient Treatment	366.1	0.2%
Parents Too Soon: Adolescent Health	3,665.2	2.4%
Protective Intervention	164.7	0.1%
Rehab. and Training/Disabled	667.5	0.4%
Rehab. and Treatment/Substance Abuse	1,734.3	1.1%
Residential Child Care	13,634.	8.8%
School Based/Linked Health Care	930.7	0.6%
Social Adjustment and Rehabilitation	30,511.	19.7%
Transportation	978.7	0.6%
Treatment/Habilitation	4,263.5	2.8%
Unmarried Parents	1,117.3	0.7%
Administration *	1,391.4	0.9%
<b>TOTAL **</b>	<b>\$154,788.7</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Federal law imposes no limit on administrative costs. Relative to the other block grants, the administrative costs for the SSBG are low.

\*\* Includes federal block grant funds of \$ 75.6 million from Title XX and state and local funds of \$46.3 million , and a transfer of \$32.9 million from the TANF block grant.

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is estimated to receive about \$74.5 million from the federal government. However the state plan/application will not be submitted until the fall of 2002.*

## **(6) LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE**

---

**Administered by:** Department of Commerce and Community Affairs (DCCA).

**Established:** This block grant was originally created by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, restructuring a categorical program for energy assistance.

**Program Description:** This program provides grants to states and other jurisdictions to assist eligible low-income households in meeting the costs of home energy. States can provide regular heating assistance benefits or energy crisis assistance, which may include cooling costs or weatherization assistance. Up to 10 percent of the funds under this program may be transferred to other block grants administered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

**Formula Description:** Since 1985, program allocations have been based on a state's proportion of the national total of home energy consumption by low-income households, with hold-harmless and minimum provisions. States were held harmless in 1985 to their 1984 levels, and guaranteed at least 95 percent of their 1984 levels for all subsequent fiscal years.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the block grant funds totaled \$96.9 million which is 4.6% of the department's appropriation of \$2.1 billion.

**State Services Provided:** The Department of Commerce and Community Affairs (DCCA) administers the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) to provide heating assistance and/or emergency assistance (approximately 81.5% of the available funds), and weatherization assistance (about 15% of the available funds) to low-income households in Illinois. The remaining funds are used for administrative costs, and needs assessment and counseling activities. DCCA relies on community action agencies, community-based organizations or units of local government to implement the LIHEAP at the local level. The local agencies are responsible for outreach, referral, application processing and eligibility verification. Approximately 285,000 clients are assisted with this block grant.

**Issues:** For the past few years, attempts have been made to either eliminate this block grant or to find other revenue sources to fund it. However, Congress has always managed to restore the program. Since its inception, there has never been enough federal funding to help all of the individuals who are eligible for assistance. DCCA has discussed the possibility of attempting to fund the program at 150% of the federal poverty level (Program requirements suggest a minimum of 125%, which DCCA has struggled to meet in the past).

**State Policy:** The primary purpose of the LIHEAP program is to assist low-income households to better afford the rising cost of energy through direct financial assistance, energy counseling, outreach and education.

**Public Participation:** The Department of Commerce and Community Affairs' Policy Advisory Council, an oversight committee consisting of representatives from state agencies, fuel vendors, legal aid groups, community service providers and public members, reviewed the plan and

assisted in its construction. Hearings were held in Springfield and Chicago to receive comments on funding levels and allocations recommended in the 2002 LIHEAP State Spending Plan. In addition, public hearings are conducted each year in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** Federal law requires that not more than 10% of the grant be used for administration and training, and that up to 15% of the grant can be used for weatherization activities. The amount of state discretion is limited since the grant funds are almost always exhausted before the heating assistance season is over.

**Funding Levels: Low Income Home Energy Assistance Block Grant, Projected Expenditures**  
(*\$ in thousands*)

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total *</b>
Home Energy Assistance	\$78,956.0	81.5%
Weatherization	14,400.0	14.9%
Needs Assessment, Counseling	150.0	0.2%
Administration **	3,395.0	3.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$96, 901.0</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Percentages estimated by Commission staff from amounts provided by DCCA.

\*\* Federal law limits administrative costs to 10% of the grant. DCCA appears to be meeting that requirement. Administrative total reflects Administrative costs at state and local levels.

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is estimated to receive about \$79.2 million from the federal government. However, the state plan/application will not be submitted until September 2002, in anticipation of the beginning of the federal fiscal year on October 1, 2002.*

## **(7) COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT**

**Administered by:** Department of Commerce and Community Affairs (DCCA)

**Established:** This block grant was originally created by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, replacing five categorical programs involving services such as community action, community food and nutrition, and state economic opportunity centers.

**Program Description:** This program provides funds to states to help communities in facilitating a variety of services for the poor. The block grant replaced federal programs formerly operated through the Community Services Administration. Funds may be used to develop programs that attack the causes of poverty, educate and train the impoverished, provide for improving the health and nutrition of the poor,

and coordinate efforts with governmental and private organizations to improve the quality of life for the underprivileged population in communities.

**Formula Description:** Each state receives the same share of funds as its local agencies previously received under the old programs, except that no state may receive less than 0.5 percent of the national appropriation. A portion of the state allocations is provided directly to Indian tribes. States are required to provide at least 90% of their allocations to local entities. There is a 5% limit on administrative costs.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the CSBG block grant funds totaled \$30.5 million, which is 1.5% of the department's appropriation of \$2.1 billion.

**State Services Provided:** The Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs (DCCA) oversees disbursement of CSBG funds to a network of 36 community action agencies and four statewide organizations. The CSBG state plan lists six goals: 1) to help low-income people become more self sufficient, 2) to improve the conditions in which low-income people live, 3) to help low-income people own a stake in their community, 4) to achieve partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low income people, 5) to help community-based agencies increase their capacity to achieve results, and 6) to strengthen family and other support systems for low-income people -- enabling them to achieve their potential.

Community-based agencies may apply for funds to provide services within nine areas or categories of assistance. These areas of assistance are: economic development, education, emergency services, health, housing, income management, linkage of support services, nutrition and self-sufficiency. Grantees must allocate 10% of the CSBG funds they receive for economic development purposes. Approximately 435,000 clients are assisted by this block grant.

**Issues:** Like LIHEAP, this block grant has been targeted for elimination by past administrations, but has always been restored by the Congress. It is the only grant that supports comprehensive, broad-based service delivery to attack poverty at the local level.

**State Policy:** The policy objectives of the Community Services Block Grant Program are to develop: comprehensive anti-poverty programs which utilize all available resources to deal with the problems of the communities' poor and disadvantaged citizens; innovative programs designed to promote self-help activities which break the cycle of poverty and encourage self-sufficiency; and efficient management systems which reduce the administrative burden on individual programs and maximize the programmatic delivery of services to the poor.

**Public Participation:** Public hearings were held in Chicago and Springfield to receive comments on the proposed use and distribution of CSBG funds. Additionally the plan was reviewed and approved by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs' Community Services Advisory Council. The advisory council is composed of representatives from the community action agencies, state agencies, client groups, and public members. In addition, public hearings are conducted each year in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** Federal law requires states to pass through 90% of the grant to local community action agencies. There is a 5% limit on the funds used for administration. The mix of services provided in Illinois has been relatively stable over the years, a result not only of decisions made when the block grant began but also of subsequent incremental budgeting.

**Funding Levels: Community Services Block Grant, Projected Expenditures**

*(\$ in thousands)*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Poverty Funding to CAA's	\$ 27,504.4	90.0%
Discretionary Funding	1,528.0	5.0%
Administration *	1,529.0	5.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 30,561.4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Federal law limits administrative costs to 5% of the grant. DCCA appears to be meeting that requirement.

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is estimated to receive about \$30.5 million from the federal government. However, the state plan/application will not be submitted until September 2002, in anticipation of the beginning of the federal fiscal year on October 1, 2002.*

## **(8) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT—STATE'S PROGRAM**

**Administered by:** Department of Commerce and Community Affairs (DCCA)

**Established:** This block grant was originally created by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, restructuring the categorical program for small cities.

**Program Description:** This program (also called the "small cities" program) allows states to administer all aspects of the program for the small cities within their boundaries through a block grant. In general, activities acceptable under this program include acquisition, rehabilitation or construction of certain public works facilities, housing rehabilitation, and economic development.

**Formula Description:** The small cities program receives 30 percent of the CDBG funds available nationally. The distribution formula is similar to that of the entitlement portion. If the state elects to administer the program, the funds flow to the state, which redistributes them to localities. A state may retain up to \$100,000 plus two percent of its grant for administration and must match each federal dollar in excess of \$100,000 used for administration.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the block grant funds totaled \$39.1 million, which is 1.9% of the department's appropriation of \$2.1 billion.

**State Services Provided:** The Department of Commerce and Community Affairs administers the CDBG-Small Cities program in Illinois under the name Community Development Assistance Program (CDAP). Units of local government (cities, villages, townships, and counties) are eligible to apply for funding if they have a population of less than 50,000 and are not within an urban county that receives "entitlement" funds. The CDAP program has three broadly-defined objectives: economic development through job creation; improvement of public infrastructure and elimination of conditions detrimental to health, safety or public welfare; and conservation and rehabilitation of housing resources for middle- and low-income or disadvantaged persons.

**Issues:** Some local officials have been concerned about the amount of funding available for the removal of architectural barriers to meet requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Because physical reconstruction/remodeling can be expensive, they would like to see more money allocated to that program. According to the plan DCCA filed in 2001 as part of the federal application procedure, the portion of the CDBG dedicated to removal of architectural barriers was rolled into the housing rehabilitation portion beginning in program year 2002.

**State Policy:** State policy is intended to promote strengthened community economic development through the creation of jobs, stimulation of private investment and strengthening the tax base. Improvement of public infrastructure and elimination of conditions which are detrimental to health, safety, and public welfare and conservation of the state's housing stock in order to provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for persons of low and moderate income and for persons who are developmentally disabled.

**Public Participation:** There is no specific block grant advisory group. However, the CDAP plan is part of the State Consolidated Action Plan submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and public hearings are held each year to receive comment on funding levels and program allocations. In addition, public hearings are conducted each year in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** States have discretion over the programs and services provided. However, not less than 70% of the funds received over a three-year period must be used to benefit low- to moderate-income persons. Since its inception, DCCA has awarded funds to local governments on a competitive basis. The mix of services provided in Illinois has been relatively stable over the years, a result not only of decisions made when the block grant began, but also of subsequent incremental budgeting.



**Funding Levels: Community Development Block Grant, Projected Expenditures***(\$ in thousands)*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Competitive Public Facilities Construction & Competitive Design Engineering	20,317.0	52.0%
General Economic Development	8,000.0	20.5%
Competitive Housing Rehabilitation	8,250.0	21.1%
Emergency Set-Aside/Public Facilities	750.0	1.9%
Planning Assistance Grant Program	500.0	1.3%
State Reserve for Technical Assistance	390.9	1.0%
Administration	881.8	2.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$39,089.7</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Federal law limits administrative costs to 2% of the grant. DCAA appears to be meeting that requirement.

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is estimated to receive about \$39 million from the federal government. However, the state plan/application will not be submitted until November 2002.*

**(9) TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY FAMILIES BLOCK GRANT**

**Administered by:** Department of Human Services (DHS).

**Established:** This block grant was created by the federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

**Program Description:** TANF targets welfare recipients, those at risk of going on welfare, those attempting to get off of welfare, and those in work programs. The state is required to provide child support enforcement, a recipient tracking system, and to comply with limits on administrative costs. The state is permitted wide latitude in devising welfare programs. It can determine eligibility requirements, set benefit levels and specify conditions under which aid is available. While providing states with a certain amount of freedom, the new block grant imposes significant federal mandates including time limits and work requirements that become more rigorous over time. In FY 1997, 25 percent of heads of households were required to be participating in a work activity. That percentage increases by 5 percent a year until the year 2002 when it reaches 50 percent. There are two time requirements: the first requires that those receiving benefits for 24 months must find work, and the second, is a lifetime limit of 60 months for receiving benefits.

**Formula Description:** Funding for this block grant in fiscal years 1997 to 2002 is based upon previous federal expenditures in the state on AFDC benefits and administration, Emergency Assistance, and JOBS.

Allocations amount to the greatest of three amounts, all based on some combination of fiscal years 1992 to 1995 expenditures.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the block grant funds totaled \$585.1 million, which is 11.9% of the department's appropriation of \$4.9 billion.

**State Services Provided:** The TANF block grant is used to provide cash assistance, work preparation, job search, child care and other services.

**Issues:** TANF reauthorization is a major issue this year. The President's proposed reauthorization plan would increase the number of individuals required to be working from 50% to 70% over a five-year period. It would also change the work requirement from 30 to 40 hours a week. Thus far TANF has exceeded expectations in moving families off welfare and into jobs. In Illinois, the number of families receiving cash assistance declined substantially since 1997. These gains have been made, however, in a period of unprecedented economic growth. There is some question about whether the success of TANF can be sustained during a prolonged period of economic decline. In the meantime, recipients appear to be transitioning into the job marketplace with some success, primarily filling service sector jobs. Some appear to be discouraged from finding jobs by the absence of adequate transportation, child care and other services needed to make employment possible. As the 60 month limit approaches, there is some concern that those running out of benefits will have to rely on township relief, a potential burden on those local governments.

**State Policy:** State policy is based upon the provisions of Senate Bill 10 and the work of the Governor's Social Services Advisory Committee. It features, among other things, an emphasis on getting welfare recipients to work and providing them with coordinated services. There is an understanding that adequate child care services that can be easily accessed are essential to putting welfare mothers to work. To that end, eligibility will be determined by regional community-based organizations, and child care services will be administered by the Department of Human Services.

**Public Participation:** The Department of Public Aid held hearings around the state to outline the state draft plan for the TANF Block Grant. The Social Services Advisory Council held periodic public meetings to inform the public on welfare reform including the child care provisions. In addition, public hearings were conducted in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** Federal law permits states to use the grant for any "manner reasonably calculated to accomplish the purpose of TANF." However, there is a 15% limit on administrative costs. Also, states must meet an 80% maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirement regarding state funds in order to receive their full block grant allocation.

**Funding Levels: Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Block Grant, Projected Expenditures**  
*(\$ in thousands)*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FFY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Cash Based Assistance	\$95,640.7	16.3%
Work Activities	98,300.0	16.8%
Child Care	179,539.4	30.7%
Transfer to Social Services Block Grant	0	0.0%
Transfer to Child Care Development Block Grant	0	0.0%
Information Systems and Technology	1,808.5	0.3%
Out of Wedlock Pregnancy Prevention	1,808.5	0.3%
Other	35,862.6	6.1%
Non-Assistance under prior law	145,818.9	24.9%
Administration	26,987.0	4.6%
<b>Total**</b>	<b>\$585,765.6</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Federal law limits administrative costs to 15% of the grant. DHS appears to be meeting that requirement.

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is estimated to receive about \$585.1 million from the federal government.*

## **(10) CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT**

**Administered by:** Department of Human Services (DHS).

**Established:** This block grant was created as part of the federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

**Program Description:** The Child Care Development Block Grant consolidates a number of child care programs and different funding streams into a single block grant. The primary beneficiaries are children under the age of 13 who reside in a family whose income does not exceed an established ceiling and whose parent(s) work or receive TANF and are in work-related activities.

**Formula Description:** Funding for this block grant consists of three parts: a base allocation, matching funds and discretionary funds.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the block grant funds total \$202.2 million, which is 4.1 % of the department's appropriation of \$4.9 billion.

**State Services Provided:** Block grant funds are used to provide child care services for low-income and welfare families on a means-tested basis. To improve services, the Department of Human Services uses the Child Care Resource and Referral Network to provide information to parents and referrals to providers. The network is made up of 17 community-based organizations, making it easier for parents needing child care services to access the system. Child care services are obtainable through the use of a child care certificate or through contracted slots with providers.

**Issues:** A major concern is the lack of capacity in the existing child care arena and the fear that the new program will increase demand and exacerbate the situation. There is also concern that with the emphasis on putting welfare recipients to work, low- and moderate-income families may be excluded from the program.

**State Policy:** State policy is based upon the provisions of Senate Bill 10 and the work of the Governor's Social Services Advisory Committee. It features, among other things, an emphasis on getting welfare recipients to work and providing them with coordinated services. There is an understanding that adequate child care services that can be easily accessed are essential to putting welfare mothers to work. To that end, eligibility is determined by regional community-based organizations and child care services are administered by the Department of Human Services.

**Public Participation:** The Department held hearings around the state to outline the state plan for the Child Care and Development Block Grant. The Social Services Advisory Council held periodic public meetings to inform the public on welfare reform including the child care provisions. In addition, public hearings were conducted in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Funding Criteria:** Federal law requires that at least 70% of the mandatory funds are used to provide child care assistance to welfare recipients, to those in work programs and attempting to leave welfare, and to those at-risk of going on welfare. A 4% set-aside is required for activities designed to provide comprehensive consumer education to parents and the public, to increase parental choice, and for resource and referral services. Administrative costs are limited to 5%.

## Funding Levels: Child Care and Development Block Grant, Projected Expenditures

(*\$ in thousands*)

Program/Service	FY 2002 Total	% of Total
Quality Activities	\$29,500.0	9.1%
Direct Services	243,600.0	74.8%
Non Direct Services	42,200.0	13.0%
Systems & Administration	10,500.0	3.2%
<b>TOTAL**</b>	<b>\$325,800</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\*Federal law limits administrative costs to 5% of the grant. DHS appears to be meeting that requirement.

\*\* Includes a state match of \$123.6 million.

*In FFY 2003, Illinois is eligible to receive \$202.2 million from the federal government. However, the state plan/application will probably not be submitted until the fall of 2002.*

## **(11) LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANT**

**Administered by:** Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA).

**Established:** This block grant was established by the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 1995.

**Program Description:** Grants are provided to local governments for the purpose of reducing crime and improving public safety. Funds may be used for one or more of the following purposes: hiring new officers or overtime pay for existing law enforcement officers; enhancing security around troubled schools; establishing and supporting drug courts; enhancing the adjudication of cases involving violent offenders; establishing multijurisdictional task forces, particularly in rural areas; establishing cooperative crime prevention programs between community residents and law enforcement officers; and defraying the cost of insurance to indemnify law enforcement personnel. Funds may not be used to purchase armored vehicles, airplanes, limousines, yachts or real estate. Funds remaining after local allocations have been made are available to the state to distribute to state police departments or to small local governments.

**Formula Description:** Funds are allocated to each state (and, in turn, local governments) based on the incidence of violent crime in their jurisdictions. If a local government qualifies for at least \$10,000 under the formula, it receives funds directly from the U.S. Department of Justice. Funds remaining after the formula-based awards are available to ICJIA to distribute to local jurisdictions not meeting the \$10,000 threshold. Funds from this program must not exceed 90 percent of the total cost of the program. The 10 percent state or local match must be in cash, but can be from varying sources such as private funds, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and the Federal Equity Sharing program.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, The ICJIA has received no estimate of available funds for this block grant. The Bush Administration has indicated that it would like to eliminate this program and combine its function with the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Grant Program for FFY 2003. At this time the status of the Program is uncertain.

**State Services Provided:** The state provides no direct services other than administering the portion of the funds that do not go directly to local governments. At the local level, funds are used for items such as automobiles and radios.

**Issues:** Under the formula used to allocate funds, municipalities tend to receive more assistance than do counties.

**State Policy:** ICJIA attempts to fund proposals from local governments that further officer safety. Three reviewers score proposals, and top-ranked proposals are then recommended for funding at a meeting of the authority.

**Public Participation:** ICJIA is, by design, an entity with public members, that conducts business including funding decisions at regularly scheduled meetings pursuant to the Open Meetings Act. Local jurisdictions must establish or designate an advisory board to make recommendations on the proposed use of funds, and the jurisdictions must hold at least one public hearing on the proposed use of funds under this program.

**Funding Criteria:** As mentioned above, ICJIA competitively awards grants for proposals that further officer safety.

#### **Funding Levels: Local Law Enforcement Block Grant, Projected\* Expenditures**

*(\$ in thousands)*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>Direct Funding to Local Jurisdictions</b>		
Formula Grants	na	na
<b>ICJIA Discretionary Funding</b>		
Competitive Grants	na	na
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>00.0</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Allocation information was not available at the time of publication.

*In FFY 2003, President Bush has proposed rolling the LLEBG into the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grants Program.*

## **(12) JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY INCENTIVE BLOCK GRANT**

---

**Administered by:** Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA).

**Established:** This block grant was established under the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State; the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1998 (PL 105-119).

**Program Description:** Project grants are available to provide training and technical assistance to states and units of local government to develop programs to promote greater accountability in the juvenile justice system. Formula grant funds are available for use in the following areas: (1) building, expanding, renovating or operating temporary or permanent juvenile correction or detention facilities, including training for correctional personnel; (2) developing and administering accountability-based sanctions for juvenile offenders; (3) hiring additional juvenile judges, probation officers, and court-appointed defenders, and funding pretrial services for

juveniles; (4) hiring additional prosecutors so that more cases involving violent juvenile offenders can be prosecuted and backlogs can be reduced; (5) providing funding to enable prosecutors to address drug, gang, and youth violence problems more effectively; (6) providing funding for technology, equipment and training to assist prosecutors in identifying and expediting the prosecution of violent juvenile offenders; (7) enabling juvenile courts and juvenile probation offices to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism; (8) establishing juvenile gun courts for the adjudication and prosecution of juvenile firearms offenders; (9) establishing drug court programs for juveniles so as to provide continuing judicial supervision over juvenile offenders with substance abuse problems; (10) establishing and maintaining interagency information-sharing programs that enable the juvenile and criminal justice systems, schools, and social services agencies to make more informed decisions regarding the early identification, control supervision and treatment of juveniles who repeatedly commit serious delinquent or criminal acts; (11) establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs that work with juvenile offenders who are referred by law enforcement agencies, to protect students and school personnel from drug, gang, and youth violence and; (12) implementing a policy of controlled substance testing for appropriate categories of juveniles within the juvenile justice system.

**Formula Description:** Funds are allocated to each state based on its relative share of people under the age of 18. Local funds are awarded based on arrest rates and criminal justice expenditures. If a local jurisdiction qualifies for at least \$5,000 under the formula, it receives funds directly. Funds remaining after the formula-based awards are available to ICJIA to distribute to local jurisdictions not meeting the \$5,000 threshold. The program requires a cash match of 10 percent of total program costs. Federal funds may not exceed 90 percent of total program costs.

**Federal Funds:** For FFY 2002, the block grant funds totaled \$7.18 million, which is 5.3% of the authority's appropriation of \$134.9 million.

**State Services Provided:** The state provides no direct services other than administering the portion of the funds that does not go directly to local governments.

**Issues:** Congress attempted to provide more money for counties than for municipalities, but counties still may be shortchanged a little. In Illinois, the demand for assistance exceeds the available funds. About 160 local governments qualify for direct funding, leaving inadequate funding for smaller local jurisdictions.

**State Policy:** The ICJIA attempts to fund proposals from local governments that tend to foster cooperation in reducing juvenile crime. Three reviewers score proposals, and the top-ranked proposals are then recommended for funding at a meeting of the authority.

**Public Participation:** The block grant is reviewed by the Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition, a group comprised of members of the Criminal Justice Information Authority and the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission. The Coalition has public members, and conducts business including funding decisions at regularly scheduled meetings pursuant to the Open Meetings Act. Local jurisdictions must establish or designate a Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) and establish a Coordinated Enforcement Plan (CEP) describing the use of funds under this program.

**Funding Criteria:** ICJIA attempts to fund proposals from local governments that tend to foster cooperation in reducing juvenile crime. Three reviewers score proposals, and the top-ranked proposals are then recommended for funding at a meeting of the authority.

**Funding Levels: Juvenile Justice Accountability Block Grant, Projected Expenditures**

(\$ in thousands)\*

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 2002 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>Direct Funding to Local Jurisdictions</b>		
Formula Grants	na*	na
<b>ICJIA Discretionary Funding</b>		
Competitive Grants to Local Jurisdictions	na	na
Illinois Dept. of Corrections - Juvenile Division	na	na
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$7,179.0</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\*Allocation information was unavailable at the time of publication.

*In FFY 2003, The Bush Administration has indicated plans to significantly reduce the JAIBG Program, no funding projection was available at the time of publication.*



### **(13) EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE BLOCK GRANT**

---

**Administered by:** Illinois Emergency Management Agency (IEMA).

**Established:** In FY2000, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) consolidated certain non-disaster funding streams that supported state emergency management agencies into the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG).

**Program Description:** The EMPG replaced the annual cooperative agreement mechanism under which the Performance Partnership Agreement (PPA) provided funds to the states for State & Local Assistance (SLA); Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) Title III; Mitigation Assistance Program (MAP); Terrorism Consequence Management Preparedness Assistance (TCMPA); Disaster Preparedness Improvement Grants (DPIG) and Pre-Disaster Mitigation (Project Impact).

**Formula Description:** Funding allocations are based according to the allocation formulas for the individual funding streams that contributed to the EMPG. The cost share for the non-terrorism portion of the EMPG is 50/50. The TCMPA portion is 100 percent federally funded.

**Federal Funds:** For federal fiscal year 2002, the block grant funds totaled \$3.9 million, which is approximately 2.1% of the agency's appropriation of \$185.3 million. However, \$1.9 million of the block grant funds are passed through to local governments.

**State Services Provided:** Grant funds are used to implement emergency management functions to develop a statewide emergency management system that encourages the building of partnerships that include government, business, and volunteer and community organizations. The expected result is a comprehensive emergency management program that incorporates mitigation, preparedness, and response and recovery.

**Issues:** Merger of the FEMA programs improves the state's ability to implement a comprehensive emergency management program. To take full advantage of the opportunities afforded through block grants, IEMA will restructure state appropriations requests in fiscal year 2003 and beyond to reflect program emphasis.

**State Policy:** The Illinois Emergency Management Agency is the state agency responsible for coordinating Illinois' response to disaster and non-law enforcement emergency situations. An Emergency Operations Center (EOC) is located in the lower level of the central office located at 110 East Adams Street in Springfield. Representatives of various agencies assemble in the EOC to provide a coordinated effort toward problem resolution when emergencies and disasters occur.

**Public Participation:** There is no advisory group.

**Funding Criteria:** In collaboration with federal and local governments, states establish clearly defined and mutually agreed upon strategic goals and priorities for their EMPG agreements.

**Funding Levels: Emergency Management Performance Grant, Projected Expenditures**  
(\$ in thousands)

<b>Program/Service</b>	<b>FY 1999 TOTAL</b>	<b>FY 2000 TOTAL</b>	<b>FY 2001 TOTAL</b>	<b>FY 2002 TOTAL</b>	<b>% OF TOTAL</b>
<b>State &amp; Local Assistance 100%</b>	\$563.2				
<b>State &amp; Local Assistance 50%</b>	2,863.3				
<b>Earthquake Preparation</b>					
<b>Superfund Amendments &amp; Reauthorization Act</b>	143.7				
<b>Disaster Preparedness Improvement Grant</b>	44.8				
<b>Mitigation Assistance Program</b>	66.0				
<b>Project Impact</b>	50.0				
<b>Terrorism *</b>	*	428.0	428.0	428.0	10.9%
<b>Emergency Management Performance Grant</b>		3,562.1	3,562.1	3,503.5	89.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,731.0</b>	<b>\$3,990.0</b>	<b>\$3,990.0</b>	<b>\$3,931.5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\*Terrorism monies for FY 1999 were included in the Shared Local Assistance requiring no matching amounts.

*FFY 2003 estimates are unknown at this time and will not be submitted until later in 2002 in anticipation of the start of the federal fiscal year on October 1, 2002.*

## **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION**

---

The Advisory Committee on Block Grants (ACBG) met on Thursday, April 19, 2002 in Springfield to hear testimony from the Department of Human Services on federal reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Block Grant currently being debated in Washington.

Mr. Dan Harris from the Illinois Department of Human Services testified on a number of different plans for the reauthorization. He suggested some plans would be better for Illinois than others. The state's primary concern is for states to retain existing flexibility within their own programs, as well as level funding.

Block Grant Advisory Committee members expressed concern about the Bush administration's plan to increase the number of hours worked by welfare recipients and the number of recipients that would be required to be employed. Mr. Harris indicated some provisions could be problematic, but expressed the hope a compromise would make the new work requirements less onerous. Some Advisory Committee members wondered how the state would implement the plan to encourage marriage. Mr. Harris pointed out that the marriage provision was a separate grant program that states could apply for or not. He felt the state could meet the requirements for receiving the money without interfering excessively in the private lives of recipients. A number of members expressed concern about the lack of increased funding for child care. Mr. Harris agreed an increase would be beneficial, particularly in light of the new work requirements.

The Committee members had no recommendations.